

Attorney Docket: 44655-284125

JUL 17 2007 Client Reference: 2011373US/Ä/KP

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicant amends the claims to correct the informality noted by the Examiner as well as correct additional noted informalities. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14 and 16-20 are pending.

TRAVERSAL OF 35 U.S.C. 112 REJECTION

Claims 1, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for containing allegedly unsupported and newly added features. Specifically the Office Action asserted that the claim language "solely" is allegedly not supported by the Examiner because the specification allegedly fails to state that a current location is determined only or solely using the IP address.

Applicant directs the Offices attention to the specification from page 8, line 36 to page 9, line 1, which explains that the simplest way to determine the current location of the laptop is based on the currently used IP address only. Thus, claims 1, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 are supported in the specification.

35 U.S.C. 103 REJECTIONS TRAVERSAL

Claims 1-5, 8, 10-12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious from Freund (US patent application publication 2003/0167405; hereafter Freund '405) in view of Freund (US 2003/0055962; hereafter Freund '962). Claims 9, 16, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious from Freund '405, Freund '962 and Schneier (US 2002/0087882). Claims 11, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious from Freund '405 and Sheikh (2002/0078382). Applicant traverses the prior art rejections because the cited prior art, analyzed individually or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims.

For example, the cited prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention wherein the personal firewall determines a current location of said client computer based solely on an Internet Protocol (IP) address currently used by the client computer.

Freund '405 fails to teach a personal firewall that determines a current location of the client computer based solely on an IP address. To the contrary, Freund '405 actually teaches away from the claimed invention by stating that the IP address, as such, is insufficient to determine a client computer's location (see paragraph 30). Rather, Freund '405 teaches using an Operating System (OS) network information Application Programming Interface (MI) to determine whether a network adapter (such as a modem, a network interface card, etc.) has

Attorney Docket: 44655-284125

Client Reference: 2011373US/Ä/KP

been added or removed from the client device, or whether such an adapter's network configuration has changed. In other words, network characteristics are detected based on the network configuration information from a network adapter of a client device.

Freund '405 also fails to teach that the firewall verifies the determined location determined based solely on the IP address, by a request-response procedure with a predetermined network element selected based on the current IP address, prior to selecting security rules for that network. The Office Action recognized that Freund '405 fails to teach that feature but referred to paragraphs [0092], [0125], [00127] of Freund '962 as teaching this feature.

However, that passage of Freund '962 merely teaches that a client registers itself to a router. Thus, Freund '962, analyzed individually or in combination with Freund '405, fails to teach that the firewall verifies the determined location determined based solely on the IP address, by a request-response procedure with a predetermined network element selected based on the current IP address, prior to selecting security rules for that network.

Thus, the combined teachings of Freund '405 and Freund '962 fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims:

Similarly, Schneier fails to remedy these deficiencies of Freund '405 and Freund '962 because Schneier merely teaches on the subject of a probe attached to a customer's network that collects status data and other audit information from monitored components of the network, looking for footprints or evidence of unauthorized intrusions or attacks and filters and analyzes the collected data to identify potentially security-related events happening on the network. Thus, the combined teachings of Freund '405, Freund '962 and Schneier fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims.

Finally, Sheikh fails to remedy these deficiencies of the other cited prior art because Sheikh merely teaches on the subject of a security software methodology and system that monitors configuration changes made to information systems within a network, which include applications including web servers, firewalls, proxy servers, log servers, intrusion detection software systems, routers and any other device or application which can be considered a part of the enterprise information system infrastructure. Thus, the combined teachings of the prior art fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims.

Accordingly the prior art rejections are traversed because the claimed features are not taught or suggested by any combination of the prior art.

Attorney Docket: 44655-284125

Client Reference: 2011373US/A/KP **RECEIVED**
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**JUL 17 2007**CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 8-12, 14 and 16-20 are patentable over the cited prior art because the cited prior art references, analyzed individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims. Thus, Applicants looks forward to receiving a notice indicating the allowability of all the pending claims; however, if anything is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant requests that the examiner telephone Applicant's representative at the number below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 021010. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

By: 

Christine H. McCarthy
Reg. No. 41,844
Tel. No.: (202) 371-6371
Fax No.: (202) 289-1330

July 16, 2007

CHM

Barnes & Thornburg LLP
Suite 900
750 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel. No.: (202) 289-1313